

irregular, painful, scanty or suppressed menstruations, * * * should be taken * * * to assist nature with * * * disorders * * * during the change of life period. * * * great relief from Pains or Headache; * * * for suppressed menstruation, * * * continue their use until relieved * * * take * * * until the menstrual flow commences again. * * * Special Strength * * * should relieve the most obstinate cases * * *

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the special strength pills contained quinine, aloes, ferrous sulphate, senecio flowers and herb, ginger root, and cornstarch, and that the single strength pills contained quinine, aloes, ferrous sulphate, hydrastis, ginger, and cornstarch.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof were false and fraudulent, since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On January 11, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9779. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. * * * v. William Robert Haddock. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. No. 14342. I. S. Nos. 4208-t, 4226-t.)

On May 2, 1921, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William Robert Haddock, Henshaw, Ky., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about August 18 and 21, 1920, respectively, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Indiana, of quantities of shell eggs which were adulterated.

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of samples taken from both consignments showed 11.11 per cent and 13.33 per cent, respectively, of inedible eggs, consisting of mixed or white rots, moldy eggs, spot rots, and heavy blood rings.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On May 2, 1921, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9780. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 Internal. U. S. * * * v. 12 Bottles * * * of Prescription 1000 Internal. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10697. I. S. No. 8817-r. S. No. C-1317.)

On June 23, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 12 bottles of Prescription 1000 Internal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Madison, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, March 6, 1919, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Wisconsin, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Prescription 1000 Internal Is The Most Efficient

Treatment For Gleet and Gonorrhœa * * * New Discovery For Gonorrhœa And Gleet * * * Also A Very Good Treatment For Bladder Troubles Frequent Urination Inflammation And Acid Urine * * * Contains no harmful ingredients or dangerous drugs; will not injure the most delicate stomach; and if directions are followed will be found very efficient."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of an emulsion composed of copaiba balsam, a small amount of alkali, and water, flavored with methyl salicylate.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the above-quoted statements appearing on the carton were false and misleading and calculated to deceive and mislead purchasers thereof for the reason that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed and in that it was not a most efficient treatment for gleet and gonorrhea, was not a very good treatment for bladder troubles, frequent urination, inflammation, and acid urine, did contain harmful ingredients and dangerous drugs and would injure a delicate stomach, and if directions were followed would be found very inefficient.

On August 9, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9781. Adulteration and misbranding of barley feed. U. S. * * * v. Hormel Milling Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10.
(F. & D. No. 13244. I. S. No. 10697-r.)

On May 17, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Hormel Milling Co., a corporation, Austin, Minn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 26, 1918, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of barley feed which was adulterated and misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained at least 7.5 per cent of weed seeds and small grains, apparently barley screenings.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, screenings, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for barley feed, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Barley Feed," borne on the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that the said statement represented that the article consisted wholly of barley feed, and for the further reason that the said article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of barley feed, whereas, in truth and in fact, it consisted in part of screenings. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was a mixture composed in part of screenings, prepared in imitation of barley feed, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, barley feed.

On May 17, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*